

IN HONOR OF LUIS FERRE ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS PASSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 10th anniversary of the passing of Luis Ferre. I rise this morning to pay tribute to this giant of a man whom The New York Times called the "dominant force in the politics, economy and culture of Puerto Rico" for much of the 20th century.

In a real sense, Don Luis personified his beloved Puerto Rico, embodying both its progress and its struggles. He was born in Ponce in 1904, a few years after Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory; was a teenager when island residents were granted American citizenship in 1917; served as a delegate to the convention that drafted Puerto Rico's local constitution in the early 1950s; was elected as the island's governor in 1968; served as a member of the Puerto Rico Senate, including as its president, in the late 1970s and early 1980s; and remained engaged in public life as a revered elder statesman well beyond his formal retirement from politics.

Don Luis lived to age 99, but it was the fullness of his life, not its length, that is so remarkable. Trained as an engineer at MIT and as a classical pianist at the New England Conservatory of Music, Ferre was a true renaissance man. He loved ideas, intellectual debate and culture, founding the renowned Ponce Museum of Art; but he was also at home in the practical world of business, taking a small company and transforming it into one of Puerto Rico's most successful conglomerates. He published a newspaper, now called *El Nuevo Dia*, which is run by his grandchildren, and has the largest circulation of any periodical on the island. Don Luis was also a committed philanthropist, who took to heart the biblical axiom: to whom much is given, much is expected.

In 1991, Ferre was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the Nation's highest civilian honor, by President George H.W. Bush, who called Ferre "a public servant of the first order" and an "extraordinary leader in the life of Puerto Rico."

On a personal level, Ferre refuted the notion that great men are seldom good men. Like any effective leader, he was tough when he needed to be, but he was also kind, warm and generous, inspiring affection and loyalty as well as respect. Don Luis was a gentleman through and through. He was "old school" in the best sense of the term.

Few, if any, Puerto Ricans have accomplished as much in their lives as Don Luis or have left behind such a lasting legacy. A proud Republican and founder of the local New Progressive Party, Ferre did not live to see his goal of statehood for Puerto Rico realized, but he encouraged and mentored a new generation of leaders who understand

that Puerto Rico's "colonial status," as Don Luis called it, deprives island residents of political and civil rights, hinders their economic progress and harms their quality of life. As I and other pro-statehood advocates work to perfect Puerto Rico's union with the U.S., we are guided by Don Luis' example and draw strength from his memory.

Ferre once described himself as revolutionary in his ideas, liberal in his objectives, and conservative in his methods. Thanks to Don Luis and others, statehood is no longer a revolutionary idea. It has become the predominant force in Puerto Rico politics while support for the status quo continues to decline and support for separate nationhood remains slight.

Last November, a clear majority of voters in Puerto Rico rejected territory status, and more voters expressed a preference for statehood than for any other status option. I wish Don Luis had been alive to witness this historic event. When Puerto Rico does become a state, as I know it will, we will look back upon Luis Ferre's life and say that this man, as much as any other man, was responsible for this crowning achievement.

ACCELERATING THE END OF BREAST CANCER ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

It is estimated that almost 40,000 women in the United States will die of breast cancer this year. Those are mothers, sisters, grandmothers, wives, daughters. We will miss them, and it shouldn't be. Thousands of men will be diagnosed with breast cancer as well.

Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women in the United States. Globally, breast cancer accounts for one-quarter of all cancers suffered by women. Every family probably in this Chamber today and across America has been touched in its life by somebody who has had breast cancer, and I am certainly no exception. My mother-in-law, Ruth Eskew Capito, died tragically at age 51—diagnosed with breast cancer. I never knew her as a mother-in-law, and my children never got to enjoy the pleasures of having her as their grandmother. The emptiness and the hurt never go away.

With the efforts of many dedicated to fighting breast cancer, we are making some progress—but limited progress—in stopping premature deaths caused by this terrible disease. In 1991, an average of 119 women in the United States died of breast cancer each day. Today, more than 20 years later, an average of 108 women will die of the disease each day. So between the years of 2000 and 2009, the cancer mortality rate for women has declined by 1.9 percent annually.

We must accelerate the progress we are making in finding new lifesaving treatments for breast cancer. That is why I, along with a bipartisan group of cosponsors, introduced H.R. 1830, the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act sets a national goal of ending deaths from the disease by 2020. This bill would establish a commission that would direct Federal and private sector resources towards the promising treatments aimed at stopping metastasis, or the spread of breast cancer, to other parts of the body.

The legislation is not designed to spend more taxpayers' dollars. In fact, the bill does not authorize any new Federal spending. Instead, it is designed to direct our existing research dollars in the most efficient way possible. The Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act will not duplicate the efforts of existing government agencies and programs. It will, instead, provide a vital check and balance and will help ensure our limited research dollars are funding the most promising science in the area of breast cancer research. In working in this way and in building on the decades of Federal investment and achievement in breast cancer research, we can move forward to end breast cancer and learn how to prevent the disease within the next decade.

So far, there are 172 House Members from both parties and all ideologies who have cosponsored this legislation. I invite my colleagues today, in this month of October—National Breast Cancer Awareness Month—who have not yet cosponsored, to join us in a cosponsorship. I look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle to spur the development of new lifesaving treatments for those with breast cancer. The hope to end breast cancer can become a reality. Let's join together to make that happen.

WATER RESOURCES REFORM AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my concerns about provisions in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act that put communities, taxpayers and the environment at risk by undermining the National Environmental Policy Act.

NEPA reviews have been useful for identifying potentially costly problems with water projects, allowing changes to save taxpayer dollars and avoid delays. This bill contains so-called "streamlining" provisions based on the flawed notion that NEPA is causing project delays; but studies have shown that other factors, like insufficient funding for the Corps, are the cause of delays. The bill limits public participation in the decision-making process, which will deny the Corps the benefit of public and expert input.

I ask the chairman to work, as this bill moves forward, to ensure that the bill does not degrade the NEPA process. I also hope that the chairman will work with me to provide the Corps the authority to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies, which is needed to complete important projects such as the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. I tried to offer a simple amendment to the Water Resources Reform and Development Act today, but the Rules Committee did not make my amendment in order.

Currently, the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to use construction funds to perform flood protection work on lands owned by other Federal agencies, but the Corps does not have the legal authority to use construction funds to perform ecosystem restoration work on lands owned by other Federal agencies. In 2013, we all believe that good flood protection projects must incorporate ecosystem restoration, and the Corps has the ability to do integrated projects like this everywhere else except on lands owned by another Federal agency. This poses a significant hurdle in the case of the South San Francisco Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, which seeks to return the San Francisco Bay to its natural state and provide flood protection and wetlands restoration.

In this case, the State of California and the United States Government, through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, own the land on which the project will be performed even though most of the funding to buy the land came from the State and non-Federal interests. The Corps has told the local partners that it does not have the legal authority to perform the ecosystem restoration aspects of this work on lands owned by the Fish and Wildlife Service and that it needs Congress to provide that authority. My amendment simply sought to fix this situation by granting the Corps that authority so it could pursue this joint flood protection and ecosystem restoration project.

I ask Chairmen SHUSTER and GIBBS and Ranking Members RAHALL and BISHOP to work with me as this bill goes to conference with the Senate in order to provide the Corps with the authority it needs to carry out this project and projects for which it has already been authorized to perform feasibility studies.

A TRIBUTE TO A TEXAS LEGEND, BUM PHILLIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Houston, Texas, lost an icon last week, Bum Phillips.

Bum coached the Houston Oilers in their heyday, 1975 through 1980.

□ 1100

Twice during that tenure, they came within one game of going to the Super Bowl.

Bum was loved because he was more than a football coach. He was a true Texan who happened to be a football coach—a Houston, Texas, football coach.

Bum understood the rivalry between Dallas, Texas, and Houston, Texas. He said:

The Dallas Cowboys may be America's team, but the Houston Oilers are Texas' team.

He knew football was just a game.

As he said:

Winning is only half of it. Having fun is the other half.

And he had fun.

In 1977, the Oilers drafted a star running back from Texas, Earl Campbell, a Heisman Trophy winner, a University of Texas graduate, a Longhorn from Tyler, Texas. In their first practice, Earl finished dead last in the mile run of the whole team. A reporter asked Bum if he was worried about Earl, could he perform in the NFL. Bum dead-panned:

When it's first and a mile, I won't give it to him.

He loved his players, nobody more so than Earl Campbell. Bum showed his love for Earl by saying:

I don't know if Earl is in a class by himself, but I do know that when that class gets together, it sure don't take long to call the roll.

Love ya, Blue; love ya, Bum. Thanks for the memories. God has a small class waiting for you in Heaven, and, yes, it won't take long to take the roll.

God bless Bum Phillips.

SUSTAINING THE ARAB SPRING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, when a Tunisian fruit vendor set himself on fire nearly 3 years ago to protest his lack of economic opportunity and maltreatment at the hands of local police, his desperate act touched off a political revolution that has convulsed the Arab world from the Maghreb to the Gulf.

First in Tunisia and then in Egypt, popular protests toppled long-serving autocrats while Libyan dictator Muammar Qadhafi was ousted by NATO-backed rebels. Elsewhere, from Bahrain to Syria, regimes have proven more resilient and, in several cases, willing to use extreme levels of violence to maintain their survival.

So, in the waning months of the third year of what has been dubbed the "Arab Spring," the future of a large swath of the global community remains uncertain. With Egypt under military control and Syria ablaze, it is not surprising that many here in the United States and elsewhere in the West view each new development with concern that an already volatile region could spiral completely out of control.

The situation in Syria is undoubtedly grim and Egypt faces a prolonged period of instability, but the news is not uniformly bad. In Tunisia, the Islamist government, headed by the Ennahda Party, has acceded to opposition demands that it hand over power to a caretaker government and schedule new elections.

Tiny Tunisia could again show its larger neighbors that a democratic transition—even an extended one of several intermediate steps—is possible in a region buffeted by the crosscurrents of religion, tribalism, and authoritarianism, and fueled by a huge demographic bulge of young people who are better educated and more connected to the world than their parents but who lack jobs and hope.

But even if Tunisia's next government is more reflective of the desires of the Tunisian people and is able to attack the problems that have retarded the country's progress, the pace of change will be slower than many Tunisians will desire. Entrenched interests and institutions connected to the ancien regime, what Egyptians have dubbed the "deep state," will conspire to stand in the way of a brighter future for Tunisia's people and slow the pace of change throughout the region.

Around the world, but especially here in Washington, the regional developments have fostered unease as events on the ground have proven less than amenable to external "management." The power of entrenched interests was more than offset by the early strength of Islamist parties in Tunisia and Egypt, giving rise to the fear of secular autocracies being supplanted by theocratically-oriented governments that would embrace the principle of "one man, one vote, one time."

This fear of an Islamist takeover has had two main effects in the first years of the Arab transition. The first is that it served to inhibit the American response for fear of strengthening the Islamists' hold or provoking a popular backlash. The other has been to drive a wedge between the United States and the Gulf Arab monarchs, who have been the most resistant to change and accommodation and understand fully the implications for their rule.

But change will be hard to resist. The same forces that swept aside Egypt's Mubarak and Tunisia's Ben Ali are at work throughout the region. The United States needs to craft policies that acknowledge the centrality of that fact, as well as the reality that this is a process that will play itself out over a generation and perhaps longer. We need to build mechanisms capable of supporting a transition in the Arab world in three dimensions: political, economic, and civil society.

Next week, I will discuss how the U.S. can help foster these three pillars of democratic development in a way that can be sustained without requiring an outsized share of our limited resources. In the weeks to come, I will be sharing a few more detailed thoughts